Case 2:25-mj-03504-DUTY Document 20 Filed 06/30/25 Page 1 of 3 <u>Page ID #:58</u>

FILED CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT June 30, 2025 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFOR

```
BILAL A. ESSAYLI
1
   United States Attorney
   CHRISTINA T. SHAY
2
   Assistant United States Attorney
3
   Chief, Criminal Division
   SHAWN J. NELSON (Cal. Bar No. 185149)
4
   Assistant United States Attorney
   Transnational Organized Crime Section
5
        1400 United States Courthouse
        312 North Spring Street
6
        Los Angeles, California 90012
        Telephone: (213) 894-5339
7
        Facsimile: (213) 894-0141
```

E-mail: shawn.nelson@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVID JOSE HUERTA,

Defendant.

No. 2:25-MJ-03504

[PROPOSED] ORDER CONTINUING FILING DATE FOR INFORMATION OR INDICTMENT PURSUANT TO SPEEDY TRIAL ACT

The Court has read and considered the Stipulation Regarding Request for Continuance of Filing Date for Information or Indictment Pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act, filed by the parties in this matter on June 30, 2025. The Court hereby finds that the Stipulation, which this Court incorporates by reference into this Order, demonstrates facts that support a continuance of the deadline to file an indictment or information and provides good cause for a finding of excludable time pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161.

The Court further finds that: (i) the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and defendant in the return of an indictment or filing of an information

within the original thirty-day period; (ii) failure to grant the continuance would be likely to make a continuation of the proceeding impossible, or result in a miscarriage of justice; and (iii) failure to grant the continuance would unreasonably deny defendant continuity of counsel and would deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

## THEREFORE, FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN:

//

- 1. The date that any indictment or information in this matter must be filed pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b) is continued from July 6, 2025, to August 5, 2025.
- 2. The time period of July 6, 2025, to August 5, 2025, inclusive, is excluded in computing the time within which an indictment must be filed, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A), (h)(7)(B)(i), and (B)(iv).
- 3. Nothing in this Order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excluded from the period within which trial must commence. Moreover, the same provisions and/or other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act may in the future authorize the exclusion of //

additional time periods from the period within which trial must commence.

Bring

IT IS SO ORDERED.

June 30, 2025

DATE

HON. BRIANNA FULLER MIRCHEFF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Presented by: /s/

SHAWN J. NELSON Assistant United States Attorney